UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,012	12/31/2003	Suresh Rajgopal	03-LJ-017	9337

7590   06/26/2008

Lisa K. Jorgenson, Esq.
STMicroelectronics, Inc.
1310 Electronics Drive
Carrollton, TX 75006

EXAMINER
ZHU, BO HUI ALVIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2619	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 April 2008_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment submitted with RCE filed on April, 15, 2008 has been entered.

Claims 1 – 22 are pending.

Claims 1 – 22 are rejected.

The 112 2nd paragraph rejections of claim 3 and 16 have been withdrawn in view

of the amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st paragraph

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 2 and 14 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 2, the claimed limitation "each hash table is allocated a *smallest number*

of memory blocks sufficient to hold prefixes for which no collision occurs within the

respective has table" was not described in the original specification. Similar argument

applies to claim 15.

In claim 14, the claimed limitation "each hash table is allocated a different group

of memory blocks from a plurality of memory blocks" was not described in the original

specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 21, the claimed limitation "the prefix length" lacks sufficient antecedence

basis.

In claim 22, the claimed limitation "configuration register" lacks sufficient

antecedence basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1, 5 – 14 and 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Hariguchi et al. (US 6,665,297).

(1) with regard to claims 1 and 14:

Hariguchi et al. discloses a system and method, comprising: a plurality of hash

tables (82-8 -- 82-32 on Fig. 2A) each storing prefixes for address lookups; and a

content addressable memory (80 on Fig. 2A) storing at least some prefixes for which a

collision occurs within at least one of the hash tables (column 6, lines 31 – 39); and a

hashing lookup search mechanism that comprises a routing table (40 on Fig. 2A)

implemented with selective hashing for a plurality of prefixes with different lengths

(column 5, lines 20 – 24); and a plurality of memory blocks, wherein each hash table is

allocated a group of the memory blocks based on a size of the respective hash table

(column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 2; column 8, line 56 - column 9, lines 7; hash bucket

160 comprises memory blocks for storing route entries; the size of the route entries in

the hash bucket of the hash table is "a size of the hash table").

(2) with regard to claims 5 and 18:

Hariguchi et al. further discloses that the at least one hash table comprises a

plurality of hash tables, each hash table containing different length prefixes (column 5,

lines 20 – 31).

(3) with regard to claims 6 and 19:

Hariguchi et al. further discloses a priority encoder (172 on Fig. 5) selecting a

longest prefix when a plurality of matches occur between different length portions of a

prefix and prefixes in each of two or more of the plurality of hash tables (column 8, lines 4 – 8).

(4) with regard to claims 7 and 20:

Hariguchi et al. further discloses that the plurality of hash tables contain only a subset of different length prefixes possible under an addressing scheme, and wherein a remainder of the different length prefixes are stored in the content addressable memory (column 6, lines 30 – 39).

(5) with regard to claim 8:

Hariguchi et al. discloses a network router (26 on Fig. 2A) including the address lookup structure according to claim 1, the network router further comprising: a network search engine (70 on Fig. 2A) containing the at least one hash table and coupled to the content addressable memory, the network search engine performing address lookups using the at least one hash table; and an external memory (98 on Fig. 2A) coupled to the network search engine and containing per route information indexed by a next hop index generated by the network search engine.

(6) with regard to claim 9:

Hariguchi et al. discloses a network (20 on Fig. 1) including a plurality of interconnected network routers (26, 28, 30 – 38 on Fig. 1) according to claim 8.

(7) with regard to claim 10:

Hariguchi et al. discloses that a plurality of hash tables, each hash table containing different length prefixes (column 5, lines 20 – 31); each hash table containing different length than prefixes within other hash tables with in the plurality (column 5,

lines 20 – 31); and the plurality of hash tables collectively containing only a subset of

different prefix lengths less than or equal to an address lengths and a remainder of the

different address lengths are handled by an additional address lookup facility (column 6,

lines 30 – 39); and a hashing search mechanism that comprises a routing table (40 on

Fig. 2A) implemented with selective hashing for a plurality of prefixes with different

lengths (column 5, lines 20 – 24); and a plurality of memory blocks, wherein each hash

table is allocated a group of the memory blocks based on a size of the respective hash

table (column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 2; column 8, line 56 - column 9, lines 7; hash

bucket 160 comprises memory blocks for storing route entries; the size of the route

entries in the hash bucket of the hash table is "a size of the hash table").

       (8) with regard to claim 11:

       Hariguchi et al. further discloses the additional address lookup facility comprises

a content addressable memory (80 on Fig. 2A; column 6, lines 30 – 39).

       (9) with regard to claim 12:

       Hariguchi et al. further discloses each of the plurality of hash tables in contained

in one or more memory blocks allocated based on hashing of each prefix contained in

the respective hash table using at least a first hash function (inherent be cause hash

tables inherently use hash functions), wherein a number of memory blocks allocated to

the respective hash table does not exceed a predefined number (inherent because the

size of the memory use in an apparatus is always predefined and limited), and wherein

a remainder of prefixes of a length corresponding to prefixes within the respective hash

table are handled by the additional address lookup facility (column 6, lines 30 – 39).

(10) with regard to claim 13:

Hariguchi et al. further discloses a priority encoder (172 on Fig. 5) selecting a

longest prefix match from matches identified within the plurality of hash tables (column

8, lines 4 – 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 2, 3, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hariguchi et al. (US 6,665,297) in view of Delaney et al. (US

2001/0027479).

(1) with regard to claims 2 and 15:

Hariguchi et al. further discloses each hash table is allocated memory to hold

prefixes for which no collision occurs within the hash table (column 6, lines 31 – 39;

column 9, lines 12 – 15).

Hariguchi et al. does not disclose each hash table is allocated a smallest number

of memory blocks sufficient to hold prefixes for which no collision occurs within the

respective hash table.

Delaney et al. teaches a hash table is allocated a smallest number of memory

blocks sufficient to hold entries within the hash table (e.g. see paragraph [0043], i.e. the

size of hash table is limited in order to reduce memory consumption).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Hariguchi to allocate only sufficient memory to each

hash table as suggest by Delaney et al. in order to reduce memory consuption.

(2) with regard to claims 3 and 16:

Hariguchi et al. does not disclose each hash table is allocated no more than a

predefined number of memory blocks.

Delaney et al. teaches a hash table is allocated no more than a predefined

number of memory blocks (e.g. see paragraph [0043], i.e. the size of hash table is

limited in order to reduce memory consumption).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Hariguchi so that each hash table is allocated no more

than a predefined amount of memory as suggest by Delaney et al. in order to reduce

memory consumption.

10.   Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hariguchi et al. (US 6,665,297) in view of Tal et al. (US 6,625,612).

(1) with regard to claims 4 and 17:

Hariguchi et al. further discloses the at least one hash table (70 on Fig. 2A)

contains prefixes hashed by one hash functions. Haiguchi et al. does not disclose a

second of the two hash functions employed when a collision occurs with a first of the

two hash functions.

Tal et al. teaches using two hash functions and a second of the two hash

functions employed when a collision occurs with a first of the two hash functions

(column 1, lines 54 – 59).

It would have been desirable to use a second hash function when a collision

occurs with a first hash function because it would provide an efficient way to resolve

hash collision. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Tal et al. in the system of

Hariguchi et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

11.   Claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 20 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BO HUI A. ZHU whose telephone number is (571)270-1086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 10am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571)272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BZ
Examiner
June 14, 2008

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619